

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed January 29, 2007 rejected claims 1-23. Claims 1-3, 11 and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The Applicants respectfully present the following for consideration.

#### Claim Rejections

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because of a recitation that is no longer included in the amended claims. The Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7, 11-15, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Grossman (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0119732). Claims 1, 8, 11, 12, 16, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sprint Online User's Guide PCS Phone Handspring Treo 300 User Guide (hereinafter "Treo"). Claims 9-10, 17, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grossman in view of SoloMio or in view of SoloMio and De Boor (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,316).

With regard to Claim 1, the Office Action states that Grossman teaches "determining) a recent item based on when an item; that is selected from a phone call; an electronic message and a contact is accessed(Para 11) associating the recent item with a contact maintained in a contact list when the item has an associated contact(Para 11); placing the recent item in a recent items list that includes all recently accessed items;(Para 11) generating the recent items list such that the recent item is only shown once within the recent items list-, (Figure 4 and 5 and para 11) and

displaying the recent items list.(Para 48).” Also with regard to Claim 1, the Office Action states that Treo teaches “determining a recent item based on when an item that is selected from a phone call; an electronic message; and a contact is accessed (Page 94 Call history) associating the recent item with a contact maintained in a contact list when the item has an associated contact(Page 94 Call history, shows recent communication aliased to contact names); placing the recent item in a recent items list that includes all recently accessed items;(Page 94 Call History) generating the recent items list such that the recent item is only shown once within the recent items list;(Page 94 Call History) and displaying the recent items list.(Page 94 Call 1 History).” In response, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

As amended, Claim 1 recites in part “determining a recent item from recently accessed items on a device; wherein the recently accessed items on the device include: recent incoming phone calls; recent outgoing phone calls; recently received electronic messages; recent outgoing electronic messages; and recent access of contacts; replacing the recent item with a contact maintained in a contact list when the item has an associated contact; placing the recent item in a recent items list that includes all recently accessed items; generating the recent items list such that the recent item is only shown once within the recent items list; wherein the recent items list includes both recent items that were replaced by a contact and recent items that were not replaced by a contact; displaying the recent items list; and displaying a context menu when the recent item is selected; wherein the context menu includes an option to create a new contact for the recent item when the recent item was not replaced by a contact; an option to pin the recent item to a top portion of the recent items list; an option to beam the recent item; and an option to remove the recent item from the recent items list.” In contrast, neither Grossman nor Treo nor

the other cited references teach or suggest that the recent items list includes recent electronic messages; recent accesses to contacts and recent phone calls.

The Treo reference is related to a call history log and shows the recent call history of the device. The Treo reference does not include within the call history recent accesses to contacts on the device or recent electronic messages that were either sent or received by the device. The Grossman reference teaches displaying “a list of expected contacts that are most likely to be selected by a user whenever focus input is directed at a type-in line, or another input object, requiring contact information” (Paragraph 0010). Paragraph 11 of Grossman recites that “the list of expected contacts can be obtained from a single contact information directory associated with a particular application, as well as from a plurality of contact information directories that can be accessed by the interface and corresponding modules of the invention.” Grossman, however, does not teach determining recently accessed items that includes determining recent phone calls (made or received); or determining recent electronic messages (made or received). Additionally, the cited references do not teach displaying a context menu as recited in Claim 1. For example, the cited references do not teach pinning a recent item to a top of the recent items list. Since the cited references do not teach or suggest determining the recent items as recited in Claim 1 or displaying the options within the context menu as recited in Claim 1, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 2-10 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

Claim 11 as amended recites in part “determining a recent item from recently accessed items; wherein the recently accessed items include: recent incoming phone calls; recent outgoing phone calls; recently received electronic messages; recent outgoing electronic messages; and

recent access of contacts.” Since none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach the recitations found within amended Claim 11, Claim 11 is proposed to be allowable for at least the reasons presented above. Claims depending from Claim 11 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.


Claim 18 as amended recites in part “determining a recent item from recently accessed items; wherein the recently accessed items include: recent incoming phone calls; recent outgoing phone calls; recently received electronic messages; recent outgoing electronic messages; and recent access of contacts.” Since none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach the recitations found within amended Claim 18, Claim 18 is proposed to be allowable for at least the reasons presented above. Claims depending from Claim 18 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy P. Sullivan  
Registration No. 47,981  
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
206.342.6200

